



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/926,237	10/12/2001	Stefano Calabro'	213920US2XPCT	2465
22850	7590	12/31/2002	EXAMINER	
OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT PC FOURTH FLOOR 1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY ARLINGTON, VA 22202			BUDD, MARK OSBORNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2834	
DATE MAILED: 12/31/2002				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	926237	Applicant(s)	Calabro et al
Examiner	M. Budd	Group Art Unit	2834

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10-17-01

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) 1-11 is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

All Some* None of the:

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 3 (1-7-01) Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2834

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pla in view of

Yoshioka.

Pla teaches an electrical transformer including a core and windings in a tank with active means for varying the volume of the transformer fluid in order to reduce pressure waves. However the active means does not include a corrugated (bellows) member driven by a piezo electric element. However, Yoshioka specifically teaches a vibration damper using a piezo electric element coupled to a bellows for adjusting fluid pressure is well known. To substitute one known pressure regulating means for another in the same environment (damping systems) would have been within the skill expected of the routineer. Thus the use the bellows driven by a piezo electric element in the transformer fluid of Pla would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Cited of interest are Sager and Mizzi (fig. 12), Blanding, Shirasu, Takahashi and Dame

M BUDD/pj

12/26/02


MARK J. BUDD
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 212